1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 8 9 CHRISTINE KRIPS, 2:05-CV-594-BES-RJJ 10 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 11 12 JO ANNE B. BARNHART, Commissioner of Social Security, 13 Defendant. 14 On February 17, 2006, Christine Krips ("Plaintiff") filed a Motion to Remand and/or 15 16 17 18 19 20 party filed objections to this recommendation.

Reverse the Commissioner's Decision (#12). On March 27, 2006, Commissioner Barnhart ("Defendant") filed a Cross-Motion for Affirmance and Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and/or Reverse (#14). Plaintiff filed a Response (#17) on April 14, 2006. The Magistrate Judge entered a Report and Recommendation (#18) on March 19, 2007. Neither

For the following reasons, this Court adopts and accepts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#18).

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I. Discussion

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2005). Further, under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), if a party makes a timely objection to the magistrate judge's recommendation, then this Court is required to "make a de novo determination of those

portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." Id. Nevertheless, the statute does not "require[] some lesser review by [this Court] when no objections are filed." Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). Instead, under the statute, this Court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." Id. at 149. Similarly, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F.Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in Reyna-Tapia as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then this Court may accept the recommendation without review. See e.g., Johnstone, 263 F.Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to which no objection was filed).

In this case, neither party filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Because no objections were filed, this Court is not required to review the Report and Recommendation, and therefore accepts it.

II. Conclusion

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Court adopts and accepts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#18). Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Reverse and/or Remand (#12) is granted and Defendant's Cross-Motion for Affirmance (#14) is denied.

DATED: This 20TH day of April, 2007.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ For an objection to be timely, a party must serve and file it within 10 days after being served with the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2005)